



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,588	03/20/2006	Yuzuru Ishibashi	0152-0727PUS1	2926
2292	7590	11/27/2009	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				MELLON, DAVID C
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1797				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/27/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/572,588	ISHIBASHI, YUZURU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAVID C. MELLON	1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/8/2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 11 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's continued traversal of the restriction requirement is noted. The argument that the process is specially designed for the production of the product is not convincing since none of the method of manufacture steps are in fact specially adapted to the product at this time (e.g. the packing density) but rather are generic manufacturing claims to hollow fiber membrane assemblies. Applicant is further reminded of the right to rejoinder and reconsideration at the time of allowance of either claim 1 or 2.
2. If applicant is attempting to state that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should have submitted evidence or identify such evidence, now of record, showing the inventions to be obvious variants of each other, or clearly admit on the record that this is the case.
3. Claims 9 and 10 remain withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 3/31/2009.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Specification

4. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is

requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haworth et al. (USP Re. 36,125).

Regarding claims 1, 2, and 11, Haworth et al. discloses a hollow fiber bundle wound on a core for radially outward flow of a fluid (Abstract) in figure 1 comprising:

- A hollow fiber membrane bundle formed of a plurality of hollow fiber membranes (70)
- A housing (12)
- An inlet (26) and an outlet (41, 40), additionally, gas inlet (22) and gas outlet (24)

Furthermore, Haworth et al. discloses a mass transfer device including a hollow fiber bundle wound on a core for radially outward flow (Abstract) wherein the packing fraction of the hollow fibers increases radially outward (C3/L25-43). Additionally, Haworth et al. discloses using incremental packing (C3/L40-53). Furthermore, Haworth et al. discloses that the range of packing fractions be such that the inner fraction is 60-95% of that of the outer packing fraction (C3/L10-27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. **Claims 1-5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boivin et al. (US 2002/0079260) and further in view of Haworth et al. (USP Re. 36,125).**

Regarding claims 1, 2, and 11, Boivin et al. discloses a hollow fiber membrane (abstract) in figures 1 and 5 comprising:

- A hollow fiber membrane bundle formed of a plurality of hollow fiber membranes (1)
- A housing (2)
- An inlet (6) and an outlet (12 and 5)

- In figure 5 a membrane occupancy ratio wherein the region nearer to the inlet ports is disclosed as denser and the region away from the inlet ports is shown as less dense (see also [0023] for instance).

While Boivin et al. does not explicitly set forth a PB/PA ratio of 0.5-0.95, Boivin et al. does disclose decreasing hydraulic permeability as one goes inwardly from the exterior of the fiber bundle ([0023-0025]). Furthermore, the hydraulic permeability is shown as higher in areas of more dense fibers ([0021]).

Haworth et al. discloses a mass transfer device including a hollow fiber bundle wound on a core for radially outward flow (Abstract) wherein the packing fraction of the hollow fibers increases radially outward (C3/L25-43). Additionally, Haworth et al. discloses using incremental packing (C3/L40-53). Furthermore, Haworth et al. discloses that the range of packing fractions be such that the inner fraction is 60-95% of that of the outer packing fraction (C3/L10-27).

Boivin et al. and Haworth et al. are combinable because they are concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely that of varied packing fraction hollow fiber membranes.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the hollow fiber membrane structure of Boivin et al. such that the outer most zone and the next zone in of the fibers has a relationship of packing densities such that the inner fraction is 60-95% of the outer fraction as taught by Haworth et al. for the purpose of reducing clogging near the core of the membrane.

Regarding claims 3-5, Boivin et al. further discloses multiple zones having differing packing densities, decreasing radially inwardly (see figures 6a-b). Boivin et al. further establishes various ratios between the greatest packing density and lowest packing density areas ([0020-0025]). Boivin et al. further discloses securing the membranes using adhesive bonding ([0026]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the packing density relationships to include consideration of 3 zones adjacent to each other such that only one is adjacent or neighboring the inlet and then two others non neighboring to the inlet and having a relationship of packing densities of 0.4-0.6 for the neighboring and 0.2-.04 for the non-neighboring as well as having a ratio such that the occupying rate is no more than 2 times the non-neighboring as a function of mere optimization. Furthermore, Boivin et al. establishes that these general relationships exist in ([0020-0025]) including a relationship between the packing density of the inner most and outer most being not more than 5-10. Accordingly, one having ordinary skill in the art would have known to optimize various ratios of the relationship between zones of the hollow fiber membranes by routine experimentation to achieve desired results as it has been established that the general claim conditions are present. Furthermore, Applicant has not established a criticality of the claimed ratios with regards to specific numerical values. Additionally, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

10. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boivin et al. (US 2002/0079260) in view of Haworth et al. (USP Re. 36,125), and further in view of Misao (JP 62204804) as cited on the IDS.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, modified Boivin et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above. Boivin et al. is silent as to the use of a cylindrical current plate accommodating the hollow fiber membrane with a plurality of through holes without one at the nozzle.

Misao discloses in figures 1 and 2 a cylindrical current plate for a hollow fiber membrane with through holes (7) and a wall (8) at the inlet to prevent direct transfer of fluid (see English language abstract).

Boivin et al. and Misao are combinable because they are concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely that of hollow fiber membranes.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the hollow fiber membrane of Boivin et al. to include a current plate such as the one disclosed by Misao for the purpose of preventing damage to the hollow fiber membrane by diverting the flow to avoid direct higher pressure impact to the yarns.

11. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boivin et al. (US 2002/0079260) in view of Haworth et al. (USP Re. 36,125), and further in view of Walker (USP 5,282,966).

Regarding claim 8, modified Boivin et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above. While Boivin et al. discloses adhesive bonding the membranes

([0026]), Boivin et al. does not disclose explicitly using a material of high-polymer having a hardness of 50A-70D in a range of operating temperatures.

Walker discloses a membrane separation device (Abstract) which uses standard suitable potting materials (C10/L1-10) comprising of urethane resins and silicone resins (C10/L15-25) which inherently would have a shore hardness test of 50A-70D in a range of operating temperatures.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the membrane separator of Boivin et al. to use silicone or urethane potting resins as taught by Walker for the purpose of utilizing well known standard materials to provide a resilient, resistant to breaking potting seal. Furthermore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have chosen urethane or silicone resins over other polymer resins for the purpose of reducing costs and increasing chemical compatibility.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 9/8/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Applicant alleges Haworth due to the radial rings of packing densities does not disclose the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 2.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. While the claim language is "which has a cross sectional area that extends between the neighboring region (A) and a side face of the cylinder opposite to the side face of the cylinder where the nozzle is located", this language does not overcome the prior art of record. This is because the claim limitation does not require the B section to physically contact the opposite side wall, so in fact, the

section A can be a wrap around neighboring region. Accordingly, the claim language does not require the profile of the instant invention as disclosed in figure 2 for example.

- Applicant alleges the Boivin combination with Haworth does not disclose the packing density as claimed.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. See above discussion of the claim language.

As a further note regarding the patentability of the claims, Applicant is advised of the Puri et al. reference (USP 5,176,725) which at C10/L9-21 discloses the possibility of differing packing densities in non radial zones as shown in hollow fiber zones shown in figures 4-7.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Puri et al. (USP 5,176,725) see specifically C10/L9-21 and profiles of hollow fiber zones in figures 4-7.
- Edwards et al. (USP 5,013,331).

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID C. MELLON whose telephone number is (571)270-7074. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 9:00am-5:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vickie Kim can be reached on (571) 272-0579. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tony G Soohoo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

/D. C. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 1797